



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION-NO.
09/930,445	08/16/2001	Timothy J. Griswold	A7807	4414

23838 7590 03/08/2007
KENYON & KENYON LLP
1500 K STREET N.W.
SUITE 700
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER

RIES, LAURIE ANNE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2176

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
2 MONTHS	03/08/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

MAILED

MAR 37 2007

Technology Center 2100

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 09/930,445
Filing Date: August 16, 2001
Appellant(s): GRISWOLD ET AL.

David J. Zibelli
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 5 September 2006 appealing from the Office action mailed 19 October 2005.

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

(7) Claims Appendix

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct. The Office notes that claims 90-93 are identified as "new" in the claims appendix, however, these claims were considered in the Final Rejection, filed 19 October 2005.

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

6,738,630

ASHMORE

05-2004

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-9, 18-38, 47-68, 77-93 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ashmore (Patent # 6,738,630).

Regarding claims 1, 30, 59, 60, Ashmore teaches the claimed invention as follows:

A method for accessing Internet addresses based on a request from a wireless device, comprising: (See abstract, lines 3-5)

receiving a transmitted short-name of a website that a user of the wireless device desires to access from said wireless device, (See col. 1, lines 60-65) said short-name comprising a code number (See col. 2, lines 49-53) representative of a particular Internet address,

searching a database for said short-name, said database being located at a location remote from said wireless device, (See col. 2, lines 10-15, wherein content server searches the content by mapping marker or short name with content) and

if said short-name is found, retrieving said particular Internet address so that said wireless device can be connected to said particular Internet address (See col. 2, lines 15-18).

Regarding claims 2, 3, 31, 32, 61, 62, Ashmore teaches accessing domain name through wireless device as described in abstract. Content database is accessed through Internet as shown in fig 1.

Regarding claims 4, 5, 33, 34, 63, 64, Ashmore teaches the claimed invention of receiving short name or marker by context server, which in turn queries content

Art Unit: 2176

database as shown in fig 4. Mapping short-name to URL or domain is described in col. 2, lines 10-15 and col. 6, lines 54-58.

Regarding claim 6, 22, 24, 35, 51, 53, 65, 81, 83, Ashmore teaches a marker as series of symbols or text string as described in col. 2, lines 49-53 to obtain domain name. It is inherent that multiple marker or short-names could be used to map single address. Broadest reasonable interpretation of root short-name, separator code and extension is a series of series of symbols.

Regarding claim 7, 36, 66, Ashmore teaches context server which receives marker from mobile device and then sends context information along with marker to content server using protocols described in col. 5, lines 30-49.

Regarding claims 8, 9, 23, 37, 38, 52, 67, 68, 82, Ashmore teaches the claimed invention of content server storing pointers to other contents over internet as described in col. 7, lines 35-40 that is equivalent to claimed limitation of searching second database. Internet searching is equivalent to searching plural databases in logical hierarchy.

Regarding claims 18, 19, 47, 48, 77, 78, Ashmore teaches the claimed invention of inputting short name through voice command as described in col. 3, lines 59-62,

Art Unit: 2176

wherein user uses spoken words. It is inherent that voice command is transmitted in digital form over the network.

Regarding claims 20, 21, 49, 50, 79, 80, Ashmore teaches a cellular phone input device with marker as described above. It is inherent that marker can be a phone number.

Regarding claim 25-29, 54-58, 85-88, Ashmore teaches the claimed invention of marking consisting of geographic location as described in col. 3, lines 12-16. It is inherent that country is described by geographic location.

Regarding claims 89-93, Ashmore teaches the claimed invention of registering and dialing a number other than phone number as shown in fig 1, wherein the marker is 42. Similarly a context and content server maps markers with domain address. It is inherent that marker or short-name is registered.

(10) Response to Argument

Appellant argues that Ashmore does not disclose receiving a transmitted short-name of a website that a user of a wireless device desires to access. The Office respectfully disagrees. Ashmore discloses that a user of a mobile device may transmit a "marker" to request Internet content. The "marker", as defined by Ashmore, may be a number, a text string, a pictogram or any other symbol or series of symbols that the user can enter

Art Unit: 2176

in the mobile device. Ashmore also discloses that the “marker” may be a word, such as “food” or a business name, short phrase, color or sound. Therefore, Ashmore discloses that the user of a mobile device may transmit a short-name, such as “food” or the name of a business, to access a website. (See Ashmore, Column 2, lines 10-17 and lines 49-56).

(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner’s answer.

Art Unit: 2176

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

Laurie Ries



3/3/2007


Conferees:

William Bashore




Heather R. Herndon
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2100

Heather Herndon



WILLIAM BASHORE
PRIMARY EXAMINER



Stephen Hong

STEPHEN HONG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER